

## REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the September 24, 2007 Office action and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as presented and in light of the following remarks. Claims 1, 8-10 and 12-14 have been amended by this Amendment D. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-14 and 16 are presented in the application for further examination. Applicants respectfully request that favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks and the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the claims in condition for allowance if necessary.

### Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 8-10 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 8-10 and 12-13 to recite “computer storage medium” for further defining the scope of aspects of the invention. Hence, the rejection of claims 8-10 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. §101 should be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

1-3, 5-10, 12-14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,928,433 to Goodman et al. Applicants submit that Goodman fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office, although citing exact passages from the specification, continues to overlook an important feature of the invention that distinguishes the cited art of record. The overlooked feature is that the property delimiter is a character or symbol... “to differentiate between multiple properties **within a metadata field**. (emphasis added)” Instead, as the Office erroneously interpreted on page 4 of the Office action, aspects of the invention should not be interpreted to cover any character or symbol that separates the **metadata fields** (plural).

Amended claim 1 recites, to further clarify, " identifying a first property category from the first metadata field of the media file, **said particular first metadata field having multiple properties therein...**; identifying a property delimiter included in the first property data in the

first metadata field, said property delimiter differentiating multiple properties within the first property data **within the particular first metadata field....**”

As already identified by the Office, the amended feature is amply supported by the specification. As such, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office’s reading of Goodman and, in particular, col. 4, lines 15-67 of Goodman.

As a background, col. 4 lines 7 to 14 indicate that Goodman’s tree structure is construed from executing a file “TreeDef.inf” which includes one or more lines of executable codes or instructions and each line is required to have the following format:

CATEGORY\_NAME|TRACK\_TYPEMASK|CATEGORY\_STRUCTURE. Each parameter or term in this format is further defined in col. 4, such as TRACK\_TYPEMASK can have a value such as 0x01, which represents “kTTSong.” kTTSong means a song type. See also Goodman, col. 4, lines 39-41.

Therefore, when an expression of “Album|0x01|LN” is included in the file, “TreeDef.inf,” it means to “create a branch called “Album” which contains tracks of type “kTTSong” organized first by album name and then track name. Goodman, col. 5, lines 3-5. While the “|” symbol is used to delineate the parameters in Goodman’s executable expressions or syntax, Applicants respectfully submit that this disclosure is irrelevant to the delimiter used in aspects of the invention to delineate properties within **a metadata field**.

Furthermore, Goodman’s additional disclosures on categories and subcategories (e.g., col. 11, lines 52-67) are based on Goodman’s usage of tree structure generation based on the same track. This category or subcategory is not based on having a delimiter within a **particular metadata field** to separate multiple properties so that one reading/parsing of the metadata associated with media files would reveal the different categories of data within one metadata field. In fact, Goodman teaches away from embodiments of the invention because the scripting or coding of Goodman would only account for parsing metadata having just one property value in metadata field. Otherwise, its exemplary format would not be able to properly parse the value within one metadata field. In other words, Goodman’s metadata requires reading of the data within metadata as one unit having just one data so that it can create a tree structure with data within a node of a tree. This is abundantly evident in Goodman in col. 6, lines 50-67 to col. 7 lines 1-14.

Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that Goodman cannot anticipate each and every element of claim 1. Hence, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Amended claim 8 recites, in part, “identifying instructions for identifying a first property category from the first metadata field of the media file, **said particular first metadata field having multiple properties therein...**; identifying instructions for identifying a property delimiter included in the first property data in the first property data, said property delimiter differentiating multiple properties within the first property data **within the particular first metadata field** and indicating the first property data having multiple properties therewith....” For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 8 and its dependent claims 9-10 and 12-13 should be withdrawn because Goodman could not anticipate or could not be combined with other references of record to render the claimed invention obvious. Hence, the rejection of claims 8-10 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Lastly, amended claim 14 also recites distinguishable feature, “identifying a first property category from the first metadata field of the media file, **said particular first metadata field having multiple properties therein...**; identifying a property delimiter included in the first property data in the first metadata field, said property delimiter differentiating multiple properties within the first property data **within the particular first metadata field** and indicating the first property data having multiple properties therewith....” Hence, for at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 and its dependent claim 16 are patentable over the cited art and the rejection of claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-14, and 16 are clearly distinguishable and are allowable over the cited art. It is felt that the above amendments do not introduce new elements or features of the coverage of the invention as claimed. It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Applicants have reviewed the prior art made of record and not relied upon by the Office in the Office and have determined that none of these references anticipate or make obvious the

recited invention in light of the foregoing amendment. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

**The Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the claims as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the claims in condition for allowance.**

Applicants do not believe a fee is due. If, however, the Commissioner determines otherwise, other deficient fees may be charged during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/TAN-CHI YUAN/

Tan-Chi Yuan, Limited Recognition, No. L0113  
SENNIGER POWERS  
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102  
(314) 231-5400

FRA/ATY/tmg

Via EFS